

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/458,019	06/01/1995	ERIC A. JOHNSON	2502495-991100	2660
29180 759	90 10/04/2006		EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD, & LLOYD LLC			LILLING, HERBERT J	
P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1651	
			DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date

Attachment(s)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ___

Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 08/458,019

Art Unit: 1651

- 1. Receipt is acknowledged of the response filed April 12, 2006 and the notice of Appeal filed August 14, 2006.
 - 2. Claims 25-34 remain pending in this application.
 - 3. The finality has been withdrawn.
- 4. The prior rejection of Claims 25-34 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No 5,182,208 has been withdrawn in view of the persuasive arguments.
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al "Phaffia Rhodozyma as an Astaxanthin source in Salmonid Diets"

Aquaculture 1980 Volume 20 Issue 2, pages 123-134.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Application/Control Number: 08/458,019 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Johnson et al recites the following on page 129, lines 16-17:

"The titer of astaxanthin of the wild-type strain of P. rhodozyma varies from 30-800 ug/g yeast, depending upon the growth conditions (Johnson and Lewis 1979). It is possible that yields of astaxanthin may be increased appreciably with genetic manipulations of the yeasts. Carotene-superproducing strains of the phycomycete Phycomyces blakesleeanus have been constructed, in which yields of B-carotene were increased from 56 to 25,000 ug/g fungus (Murillo et al 1978)."

It would have been prima facie obvious in view of Johnson et al one of ordinary skilled in the art t would have been reasonable to expect that mutations of Phaffia rhodozyma would obtained yields of astaxanthin more than 800 ug/g of yeast or at least that the mutant would have at least 800 ug/g of yeast for the mutant since the starting product produces 800 ug/g of yeast, see the following:

See <u>In re O'Farrell</u>, 853 F.2d 894, 7 USPQ2d 1673 (Fed Cir 1988), the Examiner has established a <u>prima facie</u> case of obviousness of the claimed invention because the teachings ofconsidered as a whole would clearly have led one of ordinary skill in the art to with a reasonable expectation of success.

6. Claims 26-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. **No claim is allowed.**

Application/Control Number: 08/458,019

Art Unit: 1651

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Examiner Lilling whose telephone number is 571-272-0918** and **Fax Number** is (703) 872-9306 or SPE Michael Wityshyn whose telephone number is 571-272-0926. Examiner can be reached Monday-Thursday from about 5:30 A.M. to about 3:00 P.M. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H.J.Lilling: HJL (571) 272-0918 Art Unit <u>1651</u> September 29, 2006

Dr. Herbert J. Lilling Primary Examiner

11.1.21 felin

Group 1600 Art Unit 1651